

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE,

Plaintiff.

v.

BASE CAMP FESTIVAL, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-06787 FLA (AGRx)

**ORDER DENYING STIPULATION  
TO STAY PROCEEDINGS  
PENDING RULING ON  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
DISMISS [DKT. 47]**

On April 3, 2025, the parties filed a Stipulation to Stay Proceedings Pending Ruling on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (the "Stipulation"). Dkt. 47. The parties request for a stay of all discovery in this action pending the court's ruling on Defendants Columbia Sussex Corporation and Columbia Sussex Management, LLC's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 25). *Id* at 2.<sup>1</sup>

A district court has discretionary authority to stay proceedings. *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1109 (9th Cir. 2005). "Where it is proposed that a


<sup>1</sup> The court cites documents by the page numbers added by the court's CM/ECF system, rather than any page numbers that appear within the documents natively.

1 pending proceeding be stayed, the competing interests which will be affected by the  
2 granting or refusal to grant a stay must be weighed.” *Id.* at 1110 (citations omitted).  
3 “Among those competing interests are the possible damage which may result from the  
4 granting of a stay, the hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required  
5 to go forward, and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying  
6 or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law which could be expected to  
7 result from a stay.” *Id.* (citations omitted). “The proponent of a stay bears the burden  
8 of establishing its need.” *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 708 (1997).

9 Here, the parties have not met their burden to establish a stay is warranted. The  
10 parties state a stay “would promote judicial efficiency and conserve the parties’  
11 resources.” Dkt. 47 at 2. The parties’ conclusory remarks, without more, are  
12 insufficient to meet their burden for a stay. First, the parties have not demonstrated  
13 that the balance of harms tips in their favor by identifying any hardship or inequity  
14 they will suffer beyond run-of-the-mill litigation expenses. Second, the parties have  
15 not adequately demonstrated that a stay is reasonably likely to narrow the factual and  
16 legal issues in this case or identified specifically any issues that are reasonably likely  
17 to be resolved by granting the stay. Therefore, the court DENIES the Stipulation.

18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20  
21 Dated: April 7, 2025

22   
23 FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA  
24 United States District Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28